Check for updates

Article

EJIR

European Journal of
International Relations
2014, Vol. 20(3) 647–670
© The Author(s) 2013
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1354066113497491
ejt.sagepub.com
SAGE

Before the democratic peace: Racial utopianism, empire and the abolition of war

Duncan Bell
University of Cambridge, UK

Abstract

During the final quarter of the 20th century, the democratic peace thesis — the idea that democracies do not fight each other — moved to the centre of scholarly debate throughout the Western world. Much of this work traces its origins to the European Enlightenment, focusing especially on Immanuel Kant. Yet this narrative ignores earlier 20th-century debates about the possibilities of global peace, and the role of democracy within them. In this article, I analyse some prominent, but now largely forgotten, strands of political thinking in the United States and Britain during the first half of the 20th century. They form an important part of the genealogy of the democratic peace thesis. I start by delineating four types of argument about peace that were popular in the 19th century: liberal-systemic, radical-liberal, socialist and republican. I then introduce two other modes of argument that circulated at the turn of the 20th century: the 'democratic war thesis' (the idea that democracies are war-prone) and the 'empire peace thesis' (the argument that only imperial states are capable of assuring perpetual peace). I follow this with a discussion of racial utopianism — the claim that the unification of the Anglo-Saxons could eliminate war, securing peace and justice on earth. This white supremacist vision was a call for the racial pacification of the globe.

Keywords

Anglo-America, democratic peace, empire, race, utopia, war

Corresponding author:
Duncan Bell, University of Cambridge, 7 West Road, Cambridge, CB3 9DT, UK.
Email: dsab2@cam.ac.uk

> If England and America were one they would be able to maintain the peace of the world and general disarmament.
>
> (W.T. Stead, *The Americanization of the Worl*, 1902: 409)

Introduction

The dream of perpetual peace has fascinated Western thinkers for at least two centuries. Today, it is most commonly associated with the globalization of representative democracy. A world of democracies, we are advised, would be a world free from the evil of war. The end of history, then, is figured as the terminal point — the ultimate telos — of liberal democratic capitalism. Scholarly arguments have played an important performative role in elaborating and sustaining this vision. Rooted at the very heart of International Relations (IR), where it offers 'as close as anything we have to an empirical law' (Levy, 1988: 661–662), the democratic peace (DP) thesis has escaped from the academy into the wider world, exerting a deep influence on practical politics.[1] Political theorists also frequently invoke the idea to bolster the normative case for global reform, with John Rawls, for example, suggesting that it underpins 'the Law of Peoples as a realistic utopia' (1999: 46).

The idea of *pax democratica* is usually traced to Immanuel Kant's essay 'Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch' (1795), a historical interpretation cemented by Michael Doyle's influential writings (1983a, 1983b, 1986), although other notable figures have also been anointed, including Thomas Paine (Walker, 2000) and Jeremy Bentham (Baum, 2008).[2] This mythopoeic story conceals as much as it reveals, for the intellectual history of perpetual peace is both more complex and more problematic than the Enlightenment fable allows. The conventional narrative encodes problems of both canonicity and periodization. Focusing on select figures from the canon misses much of the contextual specificity of arguments about eradicating war, while concentrating on the late 18th century passes over in silence the febrile debates about popular politics and violence that followed the uneven spread of democratic regimes during the 19th and 20th centuries. It misses, that is, the dual victory of democracy as popular institution and normative ideal. Long predicted, this world-historical success nevertheless led to a revaluation of assorted democratic shibboleths. At the end of the 19th century, as purportedly democratic states engaged in a frenzy of imperial violence, many thinkers began to question the pacific character of democratic states and explored alternative paths to peace.

Nineteenth-century arguments linking democracy and peace were invariably *monadic*, stipulating that democracies were more peaceful than other kinds of regime. The *dyadic* formulation of the DP so familiar today — the empirical observation that democracies do not fight one another — emerged only in the mid-20th century. Doyle identified Clarence Streit as the first commentator to espouse it (1986: 1162, n.2). An intellectual celebrity in the late 1930s and 1940s, Streit outlined the argument briefly in *Union Now*, a book that became a global best-seller and inspired the world federalist movement that flared for a brief though spectacular moment in the 1940s (1939: 24).[3] Extolling the moral equality of individuals and insisting on the need to transfigure sovereignty through the creation of

supranational organizations, he proposed a transatlantic league of liberal democracies which would 'eliminate inter-state war' and eventually serve as the 'nucleus' for a federal world order (1939: 214, 28). In recent years, Streit has been reclaimed by some IR scholars as a pioneering liberal internationalist thinker, yet despite his protestations to the contrary, he was as much a representative of the old imperial order as a harbinger of a new cosmopolitan world.[4] Endorsing the Western civilizing mission, he excluded 'immature' colonized peoples from his grand scheme, a point underscored by George Orwell, who fulminated that the book smelt of 'hypocrisy and self-righteousness' (1968 [1939]: 250), and Jawaharlal Nehru, who commented that while Streit's political ideal was 'attractive', the 'manner of approach towards that ideal' catalysed great 'suspicion in India' given the persistent imperialism of democratic states.[5] Rather than signifying a post-imperial rupture, Streit's vision was a product — conscious or not — of a tradition of white supremacist arguments about peace and global order that reached back into the 19th century.

In this article, I dissect *fin de siècle* debates about democracy, empire, race and war. This multi faceted discourse is largely absent from historical reconstructions of modern political thought and the constitutive disciplinary mythologies of IR. The most ambitious projects promoted the idea of a global racial peace — the abolition of war secured by the unification and planetary domination of the 'Anglo-Saxons'. However, the welcome burst of scholarship on the history of 20th-century international theory produced during the last couple of decades has not engaged with racial visions of peace in any detail.[6] Nor has the important emerging literature on race and world politics.[7] Yet accounts of racial peace repay close attention, not least because we cannot properly comprehend the nature of early 20th-century anglophone political thought in general, and debates over war and peace in particular, without recognizing the normative significance ascribed to global racial hierarchies. Robert Vitalis rightly castigates IR for upholding a 'norm against noticing' the ubiquity of racialized arguments about world politics, past and present (2000: 333). Only by acknowledging their centrality to the development of international thought and exposing them to the glare of critical scrutiny can we begin to confront historical amnesia.

The racial peace thesis was an important element of the Anglo-Saxonist ideology that saturated political culture in the United States and the British Empire at the end of the 19th century.[8] Anglo-Saxonism was 'at once global in its power and personal in its meaning, the basis of geo-political alliances and a subjective sense of self' (Lake and Reynolds, 2008: 3). Race was viewed by many at the time as the basic ontological category of politics. It supplied the conceptual resources necessary for imagining a stratified world order, bifurcated into 'civilized' and 'backward' peoples, and provided an authoritative rationale for manifold forms of exclusion, oppression and violence, including imperial conquest (Bowden, 2009; Gong, 1984; Tully, 2009). But the exact meaning of race was far from clear, its very elusiveness proving a great political strength. For most commentators, race was figured as a *biocultural assemblage*, a hybrid compound of 'cultural' and 'biological' claims about human evolutionary history, individual and collective character, comportment, physiognomy, and cognitive capacity. Differences between specific accounts of race were largely a function of the emphasis placed on (and within) the 'cultural' and 'biological' dimensions. The term 'Anglo-Saxon' was typically used to

classify a distinct human collectivity defined by a vague admixture of memory, shared historical experience, habitus, cultural symbolism, sentiment and language, all circumscribed (but not fully delineated) by whiteness. Not all whites were Anglo-Saxon, but all Anglo-Saxons were white. A pervasive reference point in political argument, race was also, as we shall see, the conceptual foundation for utopian fantasies of peace.

In order to contextualize the racial and imperial discourse, I first delineate four popular visions of peace that circulated during the 19th century: *structural-liberal*, *radical-liberal*, *socialist* and *republican*. The following section introduces what I call the 'democratic war thesis' and the 'democratic empire thesis'. The former identified the linkages between democratic political structures and inter-state conflict; the latter suggested that vast empires could cooperatively govern the world and abolish war. I then analyse the racial peace thesis, which was propounded by some of the leading thinkers and political actors of the age, including Andrew Carnegie, Cecil Rhodes and H.G. Wells. They argued, from different points on the political spectrum, that the Anglo-Saxons held the key to perpetual peace.

Varieties of perpetual peace

The long 19th century witnessed the emergence of both liberal internationalism and the transnational peace movement.[9] For the first time in history, it was widely believed that war could be eliminated through concerted human action. Although often interwoven, we can distinguish three strands of peace argument circulating in British political debate. Two of them were species of liberal internationalism: structural-liberal and radical-liberal. Socialism offered an alternative.[10] They differed in both their diagnoses of the principal causes of war and in their prescriptions for how to secure peace.

Popular from the 1830s onwards, *structural-liberal* arguments identified the main cause of war as a failure of political and economic cooperation between states. Discounting domestic variables, they emphasized inter-state dynamics and argued that free trade and the codification of international law could establish harmony. Gladstone was the 19th-century structural-liberal reformer par excellence, Norman Angell the most famous in the early 20th century.[11] *Radical-liberal* diagnostic arguments focused chiefly on domestic politics, identifying the principal causes of war in the internal ordering of states. Their main targets were the political and economic elites, who were blamed for the perpetuation of militarism and state aggression. In this account, war was fought in the interests of a privileged minority, and it thus followed that increasing popular participation would decrease the prevalence of violence. Formulated evocatively by Thomas Paine in his dissection of the belligerent character of politics 'on the old system' in *The Rights of Man* (1906 [1791]: 88), this line of reasoning echoed loudly through the 19th century. Richard Cobden made the point succinctly: 'the battle plain is the harvest field of the aristocracy, watered with the blood of the people' (cited in Ceadel, 1996: 40). Such arguments were reiterated, in one form or another, in the writings of James and John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, J.A. Hobson, L.T. Hobhouse, and Bertrand Russell.

While the radical-liberal position underpinned calls for significant domestic reform — above all, the expulsion of the aristocracy from government and an increase in popular participation — liberals of all stripes prescribed a mixture of international commerce

and international law as answers to the conundrum of war. The international trade argument — a forerunner to contemporary claims about the pacific character of globalization — was most famously promulgated by Cobden and his legion of followers, but it was a staple of classical political economy. As John Stuart Mill argued, it is 'commerce which is rapidly rendering war obsolete' (1965 [1848]: 594).[12] In the closing decades of the century, legal discourse came to assume an increasingly pivotal role (Boyle, 1999; Koskenniemi, 2001: 11–166; Sylvest, 2009), although it never fully displaced arguments about commerce. By 1900, international arbitration was routinely presented as the most viable method for pacifying the system. Until World War I, few liberal thinkers countenanced the formation of supranational institutions for reducing or eliminating inter-state violence (Ceadel, 2000: 118; Sylvest, 2009); after 1918, most supported the League of Nations or an alternative organisation with more extensive powers.

It was in advocacy of the radical-liberal position that the lineaments of a DP thesis can be discerned, for it was widely thought that inter-state aggression would diminish as the people assumed a more substantive political role. The pacific potential of democracy thus became a key feature in campaigns for franchise extension throughout Europe. Challenging what he saw as a resurgence of Spinoza's political fatalism among his contemporaries, the idealist philosopher T.H. Green offered a variation on the theme in his *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation*:

> There is no such thing as an inevitable conflict between states. There is nothing in the nature of the state that, given a multiplicity of states, should make the gain of the one the loss of the other. The more perfectly each one of them attains its proper object of giving free scope to the capacities of all persons living on a certain range of territory, the easier it is for others to do so; and in proportion as they all do so the danger of conflict disappears. (1911: 170).[13]

Socialists, meanwhile, identified capitalism as the primary cause of war. They were divided between reformers and revolutionaries. Revolutionaries, including Marx, Luxemburg, Lenin and Trotsky, posited a necessary connection between (imperial) war and capitalism, and they were largely dismissive of the peace movements (e.g. Luxemburg, 1911). Proper socialists, Lenin averred, 'understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within a country; we understand that wars cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and socialism is created; we also differ in that we regard civil wars, i.e. wars waged by an oppressed class against the oppressor class … as fully legitimate, progressive and necessary' (1964 [1915]: 299). Universal peace, on this account, could only be realized through the overthrow of the capitalist order. While acknowledging that actually existing capitalism was prone to violence, the reformists, including Eduard Bernstein and Karl Kautsky, denied the inevitability of capitalist war, and maintained that fundamental political and social restructuring could mitigate the problem. Short of an anti-capitalist revolution, many socialists argued in favour of a general strike against military mobilization (Ceadel, 2000: 173; Cooper, 1991: 210; Newton, 1985; Waltz, 1959: 128–129). The revolutionary position found few adherents in Britain or the US, though the reformist alternative was increasingly popular as the 19th century wore on, not least because it blurred into radical-liberalism.[14]

A similar range of arguments circulated in the United States, where the peace movement was far less prominent than in Britain.[15] By the turn of the 20th century, the American campaign, like its British counterpart, was dominated by a moderate form of legalism that emphasized international legal codification and arbitration, with the latter in particular considered a 'panacea for the creation of a warless world' (Patterson, 1976: 13; see also Reid, 2004; Wertheim, 2012). But in the US, there was also another strong tradition — echoes of which could be found in British radicalism — that offered a *republican* critique of the morally and politically corrosive effects of war, imperialism, and foreign entanglements. Such activities defied the prophetic words of George Washington's sacred Farwell Address. The peace campaigner William Lloyd Garrison, son of a famous father, recoiled as the US embarked on brutal imperial war: 'I despair for the republic', he complained, for 'the example of previous republics, wrecked on this rock of foreign empire' was clear (1898: 211). Foreign conquest eroded political virtue: 'Imperial rule abroad necessitates imperial rule at home. … War is incompatible with free government. It is the handmaid of despotism' (1898: 208, 210).[16]

Optimism about the virtues of democracy faded as the 19th century drew to a close. The reality of popular participation was far less inspiring than the confident proclamations of the philosophers had led people to believe. Woodrow Wilson, at the time an important political scientist, opened an essay on democracy in 1901 by noting that it was 'no longer possible to mistake the reaction against democracy. The nineteenth century was above all others a century of democracy; and yet the world is no more convinced of the benefits of democracy as a form of government at its end than it was at its beginning' (1901: 289).[17] Graham Wallas, one of Britain's leading political thinkers, registered the ambivalence in *Human Nature in Politics*: 'in the very nations which have most wholeheartedly acquired representative democracy, politicians and political students seem puzzled and disappointed by their experience of it' (1908: 2). One common source of scepticism was the venerable claim that democracies were peaceful. As both Britain and the United States became embroiled in controversial imperial wars, above all in the Philippines and South Africa, many thinkers lost confidence in the rationality of democratic publics, with some coming to view the fragile social psychology of the masses as a profound threat to progress and peace. The renowned 'new liberal' thinker L.T. Hobhouse wrote *Democracy and Reaction* in response to the crisis of faith: 'Both the friends and enemies of democracy', he observed, once 'inclined to the belief that when the people came into power there would be a time of rapid and radical domestic change combined in all probability with peace abroad — for where was the interest of the masses in any war?' (1904: 49–50). Such hopes had been dashed: the record of reform was poor; aggression and militarism abounded. 'Aggrandisement, war, compulsory enlistment, lavish expenditure, Protection, arbitrary government, class legislation, follow naturally one upon the other', he lamented (1904: 55). Hobhouse concluded his grim analysis by penning an epitaph for democratic optimism: 'the conclusion that democracies would not be warlike — if stated as a universal rule — must certainly rank among the shattered illusions' of the age (1904: 142). While popular, such responses were far from universal. In the United States, for example, Progressives continued to assert that democracy — if scoured of the monopolistic economic elites that threatened to undermine its emancipatory potential — was an answer to the scourge of war (Thompson, 1987: 91–103). But this optimistic line of reasoning was loudly challenged by devotees of imperial world order and Anglo-racial union.

War, democracy and empire

Even as monadic visions of the DP were increasingly called into question, debate over the relationship between democracy, war and empire continued to rage. New forms of argument emerged, including the 'democratic war thesis' and the 'empire peace thesis'.

Democratic war arguments highlighted the close connection between the franchise and inter-state violence. They came in weak and strong variants. Inverting the DP, the latter suggested that democracies were, by their very nature, prone to violence. They were intrinsically bellicose. The weaker (and more common) variant suggested that democratic norms and structures, rather than reducing or eliminating war, continued to facilitate it. While democracies were not *especially* war-prone, on this view, they nevertheless did little to dampen the frequency of violence; instead, they offered new channels for its expression. The spread of democratic regimes would thus not lead to a significant reduction of international conflict. Both positions drew on long-standing reservations about the populist dangers of democratic participation, amplified by the disconcerting experience of imperial war during the 1890s.

Propounding the strong thesis, H.G. Wells argued in *Anticipations* (1999 [1902]), a hugely popular volume of socio-political futurology, that democracy incentivized war between states. Unless checked or transformed, its rapid spread was likely to result in spirals of destruction, as democratic politicians needed to stoke fears about external threats and 'foster enmity between people and people' in order to retain power (1999 [1902]: 95). Wells predicted that things would only get worse: 'the phases of the democratic sequence are simple and sure':

> Nearer, and ever nearer, the politicians of the coming times will force one another towards the verge, not because they want to go over it, not because anyone wants to go over it, but because they are, by their very nature, compelled to go that way, because to go in any other direction is to break up and lose power … the final development of the democratic system, so far as intrinsic forces go, will be, not the rule of the boss, nor the rule of the trust, nor the rule of the newspaper; no rule, indeed, but international rivalry, international competition, international exasperation and hostility, and at last — irresistible and overwhelming — the definite establishment of the rule of that most stern and educational of all masters — *War*. (1999 [1902]: 95)

Rebuking the bloodthirstiness of his compatriots, William James, a great admirer of Wells, outlined a version of the weaker argument in his seminal essay 'The Moral Equivalent of War'. Levelling his fire at the panglossian advocates of democracy, James argued that democratic politics simply channelled the pugnacious habits of the people in a new direction. He singled out the dangerous volatility of 'public opinion', a live issue in the aftermath of the wars in South Africa and the Philippines, both of which had generated fervid media and public support: 'Our ancestors have bred pugnacity into our bone and marrow, and thousands of years won't breed it out of us. The popular imagination fairly fattens on the thought of wars. Let public opinion once reach a certain fighting pitch, and no ruler can withstand it' (1987: 1283). E.L. Godkin, long-serving editor of *The Nation* and one of the most prolific American 'anti-imperialists' (Beaupre, 2012),

tendered another critique of democratic passion. Initially an advocate of a Millian form of democracy, he became increasingly disenchanted, especially during the late 1890s, as the press and public clamoured for war against Spain. The people, it turned out, were not as rational and pacific as predicted, while their elected leaders fomented aggression for political advantage. According to Godkin, the jingo believed that 'if a nation is to be great it must, like Rome, be "imperial"; that is, must reign over a large number of communities of one sort or other as "war lord," and do them good, and elevate them, not in their own way, but in yours' (1897: 511). In a republican vein, he warned that the swing to imperialism signalled the end of the American dream, its collapse into the well-trodden patterns of history: the decline and fall of empires. Democracy, then, corrupted both the institutions and the ideals of the republic.

The empire peace thesis, on the other hand, conjectured that war could be diminished, even eliminated, in a world managed by great empires. It also came in two main variants. The generic form claimed that global stability was best secured by a system of geopolitical management, in which the dominant imperial powers in the system — democracies and non-democracies alike — maintained stability by limiting the number of autonomous polities (through both formal and informal modalities of rule). As such, they reconfigured the dynamics of the security dilemma. In addition to standard accounts of imperial propaganda, this argument could be found in unexpected places. J.A. Hobson — so often regarded as a key anti-imperial theorist — sketched a version in *Imperialism*, a book best known for its radical-liberal analysis of the vicious alliance between finance capital and the aristocracy. Elaborating the benefits of a system of federal empires ruling the 'uncivilized' spaces of the earth, he envisaged a pan-Anglo-Saxon polity taking its place alongside pan-Teutonic, pan-Slavic and pan-Latin entities, each 'related by ties of common blood, language, and institutions'. He continued 'Christendom thus laid out in a few great federal empires, each with a retinue of uncivilized dependencies, seems to me the most legitimate development of present tendencies and one which would offer the best hope of permanent peace on an assured basis of inter-Imperialism' (1902: 332).[18] Agglomerating and concentrating power, then, offered the best hope for world peace.

The other variant of the argument specified that it was only democratic empires — empires ruled by democratic states — that were potential agents of universal peace. Combining huge economic and military resources with the moral legitimacy bestowed by popular government, they were both capable of, and entitled to, govern the rest of the world. In one sense, this was but the latest iteration of the venerable Western imperial argument about the rights and duties of 'civilized' powers to bring progress to the 'barbarian' places of the earth, but it was inflected with two distinctly *fin de siècle* concerns: physical scale and democratic participation. Democratic-empire arguments embodied the common belief that one of the main tendencies of the age was the emergence of a small number of massive omnicompetent political units, created either through federation or conquest (or both). Henry Sidgwick was uttering a commonplace in predicting that 'an extension of federalism seems to me the most probable of the political prophecies relative to the form of government' (1903: 439). Yet federalism was only thought appropriate for advanced, 'civilized' polities, and rule by the 'enlightened' was usually prescribed for the 'non-civilized', barbarian zones — those populated by non-'white'

peoples. The democratic-empire thesis was a specific institutional variation on this general racist theme.

Franklin Giddings, one of the founding fathers of American sociology, developed one version of the argument.[19] For Giddings, war could only be abolished by drastically reducing the number of independent political units, and this meant the absorption of smaller states by 'democratic empires', above all the United States and Britain. Drawing on an evolutionary theory of social change, he rejected what he saw as Nietzsche's fetishization of power and the facile servility of Tolstoy, and argued that '[u]nless the whole course of history is meaningless for the future, there is to be no cessation of war … until vast empires embrace all nations' (1900: 357). But not all imperial forms would suffice, for if they were centralizing and despotic — or if they embraced socialism — they would 'end in degeneration' (1900: 357). Democratic empires, on the other hand, upheld the value of individual liberty and tolerated local and ethnic differences, and as such they provided a solid foundation for creating perpetual peace.[20] Balancing universalism and particularism in a productive equilibrium, the grateful subject populations would recognize the beneficence of their overlords and social evolution could be channelled in a pacific direction:

> Only when the democratic empire has compassed the uttermost parts of the world will there be that perfect understanding among men which is necessary for the growth of moral kinship. Only in the spiritual brotherhood of that secular republic, created by blood and iron not less than by thought and love, will the kingdom of heaven be established on earth. (1900: 357)

A similar argument was defended by the eminent British idealist philosopher D.G. Ritchie.[21] Like Giddings, he believed in both civilizational imperialism and the possibility of perpetual peace — indeed, he regarded the former as a necessary condition for the latter. The lesson he drew from Kant had nothing to do with democracy or republicanism, but instead concentrated on political autonomy: 'Kant saw quite clearly', Ritchie maintained, 'that there is only one way in which war between independent nations can be prevented; and that is by the nations ceasing to be independent' (1901a: 157). The 'prevention of war within great areas' would thus follow from the absorption of small states by large ones, either through coercion or voluntary union (1901a: 157). Again taking his cue from Kant, Ritchie argued that while federation — 'the greatest political invention of modern times' (1901a: 152) — was an important solvent of sovereignty, insofar as it eliminated the anarchic international state of nature, it was radically incomplete and democratic empires were required to rule the backward populations of the earth:

> A federation of civilized nations may be possible, when they are all constitutionally governed; but there may also remain large parts of the earth unfit for constitutional government. Tropical lands are apt to become black anarchies or white tyrannies; and in the interest of black and white alike the controlling hand of governments influenced by the ideas of temperate and civilized countries is absolutely necessary…. This is a federation of the world, which is not an altogether visionary ideal. The 'European Concert', international congresses of all kinds,

> existing federal institutions — these are the germs out of which may grow the diminution, the mitigation, and, possibly, the cessation of wars. (1901a: 157–158).

Arguments of this kind did not go unchallenged. J.M. Robertson, another prominent British liberal, replied directly to Ritchie, accusing him of utilizing faulty consequentialist reasoning to encourage endless foreign conquest in the name of peace. Echoing the republican critique, he castigated such arguments for undercutting the very foundations of democracy:

> When, then, a democracy or a quasi-democracy proceeds to coerce another self-governing community on the plea of advancing civilization, it is giving the lie to its own fundamental principle, and the professed democrats who justify such coercion are men forsworn. And the sequel is historically so sure that we may call it a law of political evolution. The principle of democracy, negated at its source, suffers paralysis; and the ruling community comes to be ruled by the brute force it had created and sanctioned. (1901: 284)[22]

In an account of the 'ethics of internationalism' published in 1906, Hobson both challenged Ritchie and silently refuted his own earlier argument about the pacific character of 'inter-imperialism'. He argued that although the peoples of the world were becoming interdependent, and consequently lacked good reasons for embarking on war, nefarious elites continued to propagate a Hobbesian vision of states as autonomous self-interested units: 'The apparent oppositions of interest between nations … are not oppositions between the interests of people conceived as a whole; they are oppositions of class interests within the nation' (1906: 28). While critical of the Cobdenite line that commerce would eliminate war — on the grounds that it had failed to take account of the role of class interests in generating conflict — Hobson reserved his greatest ire for the 'new imperialists' who dreamt that empires would establish perpetual peace. The result was deeply reactionary: 'a few gigantic empires dividing the earth between them, coterminous with one another, powerful, definite and rich, will form a new sort of equilibrium of forces — fear, not gain, and not love, is designated as the ultimate peacemaker' (1906: 23). Singling out Ritchie, whom he nevertheless praised as one of the 'great ethical teachers in England of recent years' (1906: 27), Hobson stressed that such a vision was anathema to internationalism because it was based on a flawed social ontology and eradicated individual and national liberty. Instead, he outlined a more subtle variant on the monadic DP argument:

> the conception of a real republic, by which is meant an effective democracy, is essential to the achievement of peaceable relations between the nations of the world; not of course the mere form of a republic, not a form in which the power of the people is usurped by bosses and formally registered by the vote of the people, but a real republic in which the people themselves, the several units, express themselves with freedom and equality in the determination of their own affairs. (1906: 28)

The argument for democracy could be restated, in other words, by drawing a distinction between form and content — much as the American Progressives were doing across the Atlantic. The crude simulacra of democracy existing at the time provided a cloak of

legitimacy for the continued rule of war-mongering elites, for only in an *authentic* democracy, free from the distorting effects of class power, would the people recognize that peaceful cooperation was in their interest. In order to salvage the DP argument from the cauldron of imperial aggression it was necessary to re-evaluate the meaning of democracy itself, demarcating its aberrant and ideal forms. This complex task was undertaken by numerous thinkers during the ensuing decades.

Ending the 'murder of men by men': *Fin de siècle* racial utopianism

It was this freighted political conjuncture that spawned the discourse over Anglo-American unity. In the decades following the War of Independence, relations between Britain and the US oscillated between mutual suspicion and antagonism, but as the 19th century drew to a close, thinkers and politicians on both sides of the Atlantic argued for closer cooperation (Anderson, 1981; Campbell, 2007; Kupchan, 2010: 73–112). The 1890s was the turning point: a trickle of interest turned into a flood. This discursive shift established the intellectual foundations for the 'special relationship' that was to play such a fundamental role in the 20th century and beyond.

Drawing on constructivist insights, Srdjan Vucetic argues that patterns of Anglo-American cooperation originate in the erection of a 'racial peace' between the two powers at the end of the 19th century (2011a, 2011b). The rapprochement was 'established on the basis of race, or, more specifically, because American and British elites succeeded in framing their community as a single Anglo-Saxon brotherhood' (2011b: 403–404). Democracy played only a derivate role: 'the Anglo-American elites indeed understood each other as fellow democrats, but their antecedent ontology was always race, not regime type' (2011b: 413; cf. Kupchan, 2010). While concurring with this, I want to move beyond Vucetic's persuasive analysis by elucidating the ways in which race was figured not simply as an aspect of Anglo-American relations, but as a world-historical force capable of transforming human existence. The process that Vucetic identified was an *intra-racial peace project* — the realization of a security community *between* the 'Anglo' powers. But the discourse of the time encompassed a far more ambitious claim about *universal racial peace*: interstate war itself could be abolished through Anglo-world unity. Joseph Chamberlain, at the time Secretary of State for the Colonies, proclaimed that the 'union — the alliance, if you please — the understanding between these two Great nations is indeed a guarantee for the peace of the world' (1899: 7). Lyman Abbott, a leading American Congregationalist theologian and political commentator, dreamt of an Anglo century — even millennium: '[T]hese two nations, embodying the energy, the enterprise, and the conscience of the Anglo-Saxon race, would by the mere fact of their cooperation produce a result in human history which would surpass all that present imagination can conceive or present hope anticipate' (Abbott, 1898: 521). A decade later, a distinguished Australian politician was still proclaiming that '[p]eace could have no better champions. Humanity could have no better allies. Their united power is the best guaranty the world has ever had of a new reign of justice, liberty and progress in all parts of the globe' (Reid, 1909: 409).[23]

Adopted by thinkers across the political spectrum, projects for the unification of the Anglo-Saxons were in principle compatible with liberal, radical, socialist and republican analyses of the causes of war. A wide array of institutional configurations were proposed. The least ambitious were plans for closer political and economic cooperation between the United States and the British Empire. Others advocated a defensive treaty between the two powers. The most far-reaching, produced largely though not exclusively by British thinkers, demanded the formal political (re)unification of the Anglo-world. These ranged from the creation of a racial isopolity — common citizenship between the constituent polities of the Anglo-world (Bell, 2013) — to full-blown federal union. Though differing widely in their proposed institutional architectures, the schemes were all premised on the pivotal importance of race as a factor in world politics, and in particular on the ethico-political superiority of the Anglo-Saxons.

I want to argue that we can interpret aspects of the debate over the future of the Anglo-world as expressions of utopian desire. By viewing them through this prism, we can recover a sense of their transformative ambition and locate them within the wider cultural matrix that produced them. While the late 19th century witnessed an explosion of utopian literary production (Claeys, 2009), scholars have failed to read this burst of social prophecy and the discourse of global racial peace in the same analytical frame. Both, though, were responses to a ramifying set of social, political, economic and cultural anxieties, and both expressed a desire to confront or defuse those anxieties through establishing novel forms of life. They also both placed the latest scientific and technological discoveries at the heart of their projects, seeing in them the material and symbolic means through which their grandiose ambitions could be achieved. We can illuminate the dynamics of *fin de siècle* utopianism and imperial discourse by interpreting them as articulations of similar anxieties and dreams.

However, before proceeding, it is first necessary to outline what I mean by utopia, for in political theory it is a term loaded with conflicting meanings (Levitas, 1990), while in IR it is typically employed as a dismissive insult rather than a perspicacious analytical category. On my account, a political project can be considered utopian if, and only if, it invokes or prescribes the radical transformation or elimination of at least one of the pervasive practices or ordering principles that shape human collective life. These include poverty, socio-economic inequality, war, the biochemical composition of the environment and the ontological constitution of human beings, including death itself. Utopianism of this kind is premised on the idea of a fundamental change in the order of things.[24] We see in the *fin de siècle* debates over world order a strain of argument which figured the Anglo-world (and especially Anglo-America) as a utopian polity that was realizable through intentional human action. Human ingenuity, and above all the manipulation of new technologies, both communicative and political, could create a racial-political order that guaranteed peace on earth.

The late 19th-century debate over universal racial peace was triggered by the publication of Andrew Carnegie's essay 'A Look Ahead' in 1893. Originally an emigrant from Scotland, by the 1890s, Carnegie was one of the world's wealthiest and most powerful men, an infamous strike-breaker, a stalwart of the peace movement on both sides of the Atlantic, and a leading critic of American and British imperialism. He was also a tireless proponent of Anglo-American union and racial utopianism. These diverse commitments

cohered neatly in his mind. Following his 'master' Herbert Spencer, Carnegie believed that the world was evolving inexorably from a violent past to a cooperative, peaceful future — from 'militant' to 'industrial' stages of society, in Spencerian terms.[25] Although inevitable, human progress could be accelerated or retarded by political choices. Imperialism was retrograde, damaging to the imperial power and its victims alike, but Anglo-racial union was capable of securing a better future for the world. To hasten the end of history, Carnegie advocated the formal (re)union of Britain, the United States, and Canada — though he was never very clear about the specific institutional arrangement he had in mind (e.g. Carnegie, 1893, 1909). The detail, though, was less important to him than the empirical conditions and the moral imperatives that demanded union. The Anglo-Saxons, he asserted, were bound by 'language, literature, religion, and law'; they differed only — and superficially — in their political institutions (1893: 10). Race was the key factor. Writing of the peaceful resolution of the Venezuela dispute, he proclaimed that '[r]ecent events have proven, I assume, to the satisfaction of most men that "Race" is the most powerful determining influence upon men … for upon Race hang common language, Religion, literature, law, and, in the main, political institutions. When these elements are subtracted from human nature or action it will be found that not much of a controlling character remains' (1898: 1). The 'English-speaking race', as he was fond of calling it, were the pioneers of progress, the leading-edge of human development.

Utilizing a common trope, Carnegie maintained that new technological conditions meant that reunion was essential. The late 19th century saw a major cognitive shift, a revolution in political consciousness, as perceptions of time and space were reconfigured by the impact of the electrical telegraph. This created a new governance *episteme* in which projects for the creation of globe-spanning political communities came to be seen as both feasible and necessary (Bell, 2007, 2012). Electrical communication technologies were, Carnegie proclaimed, 'the most important factor in rendering political union possible, and I venture to say inevitable', for they sustained an imagined Anglo-community straddling the Atlantic (1893: 11). The reunified polity would inaugurate an era of peace: 'The new nation would dominate the world and banish from the earth its greatest stain — the murder of men by men' (1893: 12–13). Moreover, the transition to the new world order would be peaceful, for 'such a giant among pigmies would never need to exert its power, but only to intimate its wishes and decisions', and, as such, global disarmament would invariably follow, as it 'would be unnecessary for any power to maintain a great standing army or a great navy' (1893: 13). In a racialized account of unipolarity, Carnegie insisted that the reunited Anglo-polity would simply deter other states from attempting to compete. He energetically supported both Anglo-American union and international arbitration as engines of peace for the remainder of his life.

While Carnegie was not the first to preach the creed of racial utopia, his essay spawned considerable debate.[26] Most commentators recognized the utopian ambition of his argument, though reactions ranged from the celebratory to the scornful. Admiring yet sceptical, the British naval strategist Charles Beresford wrote that '[w]ere it possible for his happy dream to be converted into a reality, the English-speaking nations could control the future of the world, insure perpetual peace and prosperity, and maybe advance the advent of the millennium', while for the American historian and naval theorist A.T. Mahan, Carnegie's vision was 'rational though premature' (Mahan and Beresford, 1894:

570, 555). Both men offered their own more modest plans for Anglo-American cooperation in reply.[27] Not all responses were so polite. Goldwin Smith, a British émigré to North America and by then the most prominent intellectual in Canada, poured scorn on the idea:

> But such a thing as a political or even a diplomatic unity of the English-speaking communities scattered over the globe is surely inconceivable. Supposing such a union possible, what definite object would it have? Where would its centre be? Who would direct its policy? By its irresistible power, we are told, it would impose peace upon the world. Unfortunately, consciousness of irresistible power is more apt to incline to aggression than to the enforcement of peace, while the jealousy which such combination would excite could hardly fail to lead to counter-combination and call the rest of the world to arms. (1893: 172)[28]

Most of its advocates spent little time discussing the mechanisms that would translate Anglo-unity into perpetual peace, though we can discern two (usually interwoven) lines of argument. One focused on brute geopolitical power: the combined military and industrial resources of the Anglo-world would be so overwhelming that potential competitors would be deterred from challenging it or each other. The other focused on moral legitimacy: the Anglo-Saxons could and should claim this privileged role due to their unique political virtues. Conjoined, they formed a potent moralized geopolitical vision. In a typical example of the genre, Beresford wrote of his own plan for a defensive alliance that '[g]eographically, and by virtue of character and numbers, such an alliance would be irresistible in promoting peace. Who can doubt that the heavy sword which the united Anglo-Saxon race could throw into the balance would constitute them the arbiters between contending nations?' He then adduced a normative claim about the special responsibilities bestowed by racial superiority: 'And what race has ever shown itself more fitted to such power, so honestly likely to wield it with honour and justice?' (1899: 382).

The project for a new Anglo century created unlikely intellectual alliances. Cecil Rhodes, W.T. Stead and H.G. Wells, for example, all promoted the utopian ideal. An advanced liberal and an influential figure in the British peace movement, Stead was one of the foremost journalists in the Anglo-American world (Luckhurst et al., 2012). He was both a long-standing friend of Carnegie, the self-professed political radical and anti-imperialist, and a fawning admirer of Rhodes, the most controversial imperialist of the day. Rhodes once lamented that he felt helpless gazing into the night sky, that he would 'annex the planets' if he could (1902: 190). While cosmic empire remained forever outside his grasp, he was convinced that peace on earth was possible. He maintained that the greatest tragedy of modern history was the splitting asunder of the two main branches of the 'Anglo-Saxon race' in the American War of Independence, and that the only way to repair the damage, and to fulfil the providential role of the race, was to reunite the two polities. Rhodes wrote to Stead, 'that if we had not lost America, or even if now we could arrange with the present members of the United States Assembly and our House of Commons, the peace of the world is secured for all eternity!' Rhodes thought that the American constitution was superior to the British, and he was happy for the Americans to lead the English-speaking peoples if the British were not prepared to assume the

sacred role. Ideally, though, the job of securing perpetual peace could be shared between them, and he proposed a solution to the constitutional dilemma: 'We could hold your federal parliament for five years at Washington and five at London' (1902: 73). In a letter written in 1891, Rhodes prophesized that union with the United States would mean 'universal peace' within one hundred years (1902: 66). As one of his admirers wrote in a posthumous homily, 'Rhodes wanted peace and the power to enforce it. To his idea [*sic*] the understanding of the Anglo-Saxon race meant the necessary peace of the world' (Cust, 1902: 113).

In his fulsome commentary on Rhodes's writings, Stead concurred that the 'English-speaking race is one of the chief of God's chosen agents for executing coming improvement in the lot of mankind' (1902: 100), and he elaborated on this fantasy in his best-selling *The Americanization of the World*. He started by observing that the Americans had overtaken the British in most aspects of life, and that those ruling in London now faced a stark choice: ally with the United States in a grand project of earthly redemption or become increasingly irrelevant, as the empire slowly weakened and the settler colonies seceded and looked to Washington for leadership. In colony after colony, country after country, American influence was outstripping that of the British, while Britain itself was slowly being Americanized. The process was both irresistible and a cause for celebration: 'there is no reason to resent the part the Americans are playing in fashioning the world in their image, which, after all, is substantially the image of ourselves' (1903: 2).[29] He sought, then, to 'constitute as one vast federated unity the English-speaking United States of the World' (1903: 397). Such a polity would beget perpetual peace. If 'England and America were one', Stead predicted, 'they would be able to maintain the peace of the world and general disarmament' (1902: 409):

> war would by degree die out from the face of the earth. If you had the Anglo-Saxon race acting on a common ground, they could determine the balance of power for a fully peopled earth. Such a moral force would be irresistible and argument would take the place of war in the settlement of international disputes. As the second great result of the cohesion of the race we should have life quickened and developed, and unemployed energies called into action in many places where they now lie stagnant. (1903: 435)

For Stead, then, racial union would accelerate existing efforts to 'civilize' the rest of the world. Intra-racial peace would thus establish the conditions for an irresistible liberal empire that would ultimately create universal racial peace.

A self-professed socialist, Wells emphasized the importance of Anglo-American unity over the course of his long and celebrated career.[30] In *Anticipations*, he predicted the emergence of a world state ruled over by a new techno-managerial class of 'efficients' — the 'kinetic men' of the future. Unlike most of his comrades, Wells did not regard capitalism as the primary or sole cause of war. It was the very existence of the sovereign state that generated conflict (1934: 689), and like many other late Victorians, he thought that the best solution was to reduce the number of units populating the system. The unification of the 'English-speaking peoples' assumed a crucial role in this task. This 'great federation' would have its headquarters in the 'great urban region that is developing between Chicago and the Atlantic'. Adopting a similar time horizon to Rhodes, he

predicted that by the year 2000, the English-speaking people would constitute a federal state, united by 'practically homogeneous citizenship', and that this polity would govern all the 'non-white states of the present British Empire, and in addition much of the South and Middle Pacific, the East and West Indies, the rest of America, and the larger part of black Africa'. It would maintain — and enforce — the peace of the world. Like many of his contemporaries, he regarded this political 'synthesis' as 'probable'. His account was vanguardist in a double sense, for not only were the English-speaking peoples to lead the way to a further global 'synthesis' — a world-state-to-come — but this drive was itself led by a select group of individuals, men (*sic*) of energy, determination, and drive, who would help to dissolve, either through social revolution or in the wake of war, the remaining barriers to its realization found in 'deliquescing' modern societies. The efficients would act as a largely uncoordinated 'Secret Society' — an idea also pushed by Rhodes — to help bring about a new era in human history. However, peace would not follow automatically. Wells mixed hard-edged pessimism with his idealism, and, like Kant, he thought that violence would be needed to pacify reactionary elements of the global population (e.g. 1934: 678). A war would be fought to end all war, but once the resistance had been extirpated, peace and justice would reign.

The issue of transition — of how to move from a world of war to a world of peace — marked an important division within the discourse of racial utopianism. For many of its advocates, including Carnegie and Stead, the movement would itself be peaceful; their utopianism thus encompassed the mechanisms and the telos of transformation. Others, like Wells, argued that war would be necessary to achieve peace. This vision of racial peace-through-conflict was also a common feature of the popular 'future war' literary genre that flourished at the end of the 19th century. A steady stream of novels portrayed colossal global clashes culminating in Anglo-American alliance and the final abolition of conflict. In Britain, Louis Tracy's popular *The Final War* concluded with Britain and the United States defeating the combined powers of Europe and fulfilling the 'destiny of the race': 'to soothe ambition, to repair injustice, to mete out to all freedom before the law of justice'. Perpetual peace beckoned: 'So peace ruled: not that sullen silence which harbours in its breast poisonous passions, but a peace such as the world had never known, deep, eternal, and serene' (1896: 458). Similar volumes appeared in the United States. Thus Stanley Waterloo's *Armageddon*, Benjamin Rush Davenport's *Anglo-Saxon's, Onward!* and S.W. Odell's, *The Last War*, all published in 1898 as the US launched an imperial war against Spain, end with future Anglo-world cooperation heralding everlasting peace.[31] Odell, for instance, concluded his genocidal tale with the Anglo-Saxons finally extinguishing the last gasp of resistance to their model of 'human perfection' in the year 2600. With the creation of the 'United States of the World', '[t]he dream of the ages has been realized and peace assured to the human race forever' (1898: 160).

As these writings highlight, it was not just British commentators who thought that universal peace was achievable through Anglo-Saxon union. Father of a famous son, John Randolph Dos Passos, an important New York lawyer and author of *The Anglo-Saxon Century and the Unification of the English-speaking People*, was similarly optimistic. As time and space were reconfigured, so the world came to seem simultaneously more dangerous and more open to transformation through human agency. It was time

to create a racial union, which would, among many benefits, lead to the 'elimination of war and the advancement of civilisation', because 'power lodged in the proper hands hurts no one' (1903: vii, xiii). In a quasi-Hegelian vein, the workings of reason in history offered proof:

> History, in all its stages, conjectural, traditional, and authentic, discloses with almost painful clearness that there are underlying forces governing the progress of the human race, which are made manifest in successive ages only by their results, and with which conscious volition seems to have but little to do. … If I am right in what I have said of the Anglo-Saxon race in its two great branches, the inference becomes clear. To that race primarily belongs in a preponderating degree the future of mankind, because it has proved its title to its guardianship. (1903: 47)

Writing a decade after the turn-of-the-century frenzy of Anglo triumphalism, the journalist H. Perry Robinson asserted, without much in the way of argument, that '[t]he ultimate domination of the world by the Anglo-Saxon (let us call him so) seems to be reasonably assured; and no less assured is it that at some time wars will cease'. All that remained was the issue of political will: 'The question for both Englishmen and Americans to ask themselves is whether, recognizing the responsibility that already rests upon it, the Anglo-Saxon race dare or can for conscience' sake — hang back and postpone the advent of Universal Peace, which it is in its power to bring about — to-day, no matter what the motives of jealousy, or self-interest, or of self-distrust may be than retrain it' (1911: 19). Although racial utopianism of this kind was blunted by the horrors of World War I, it continued to find supporters deep into the 20th century.

Conclusion

In this article, I have analysed some of the most prominent arguments about perpetual peace circulating in the Atlantic world at the end of the 19th century. At the time, long-standing radical claims about the inherent peacefulness of democracy were often challenged as democratic states launched imperial wars in Africa and Asia. Meanwhile, the utopian energies of the earlier peace campaigners had drained away as the transnational peace movement campaigned incessantly for international arbitration and the juridification of the international system. The most ambitious projects for abolishing war centred on global imperial management and the racial unity of the Anglo-Saxons.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the following for their insightful comments: Martin Ceadel, Gregory Claeys, Joel Isaac, Daniel Matlin, Stefano Recchia, Casper Sylvest, John A. Thompson and Stephen Wertheim. Thanks also to participants in seminars at the Universities of Birmingham and Cambridge, and the Association of Political Thought conference in Oxford (2013). The article is dedicated to the memory of Istvan Hont, a magnificent scholar and friend.

Funding

Research for this article was generously supported by the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (Cambridge), the Cambridge Humanities Fund, and the Leverhulme Trust.

Notes

1. For a review of the empirical literature, see Hayes (2011). On the DP's performative dimensions, see Hobson et al. (2011); Ish-Shalom (2013); Oren (1995).
2. An interesting case has also been made for Giuseppe Mazzini, writing in the mid-19th century (Recchia and Urbinati, 2009). The popularity of Kant's argument has waxed and waned (Easley, 2005). Moreover, it has often been mischaracterized. Cavallar (2001), for example, suggests that Doyle misses the complex relation between the transcendental and practical dimensions of Kant's philosophy. For Kant's context, see Nakhimovsky (2011).
3. For intellectual context, see Wooley (1988).
4. For prominent references to Streit, see Ikenberry (2001: 178); Deudney (2007: 241, 335n); Weiss (2009: 260).
5. Letter from Nehru to Samuel Spalding, 23 February 1940, 'India' file, Box I: 65, Streit papers, Library of Congress. Streit remained sensitive to this charge. In testimony before Congress in 1947, he insisted that 'there was no color line in my choice of founders [of the League of Democracies]. My choice was based on political principle. I proposed to begin the Union of the Free with the most experienced democracies, and so I omitted not only India and China but Russia and many other white countries' (Statement to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalisation, 7 March 1945, 'India'). This was largely to miss the point of the critique, though, as Streit simply reiterated the racialized language of mature/immature so central to imperial strategies of exclusion.
6. This literature is surveyed in Bell (2010a) and Schmidt (2012a). Valuable examples include: Ceadel (2000); Schmidt (2012b); Sylvest (2009). Barkawi (2010), Schmidt (1998: ch. 4) and Vitalis (2000, 2010) address the pivotal role of empire and race in disciplinary history.
7. The closest analysis to my own is Vucetic (2011a), which I address later in the article. Hobson (2012: chs 4–5) covers the period, but does not discuss this discourse. For important interventions on race and IR, see the special editions of *Alternatives* (26(4), 2001) and the *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* (26(1), 2013); Doty (1993); Shilliam (2006, 2008).
8. On conceptions of 'whiteness' in an 'Anglo-world' context, see Anderson (1981); Kramer (2002); Lake and Reynolds (2008: esp. Part II); Schwarz (2011: chs 1–3).
9. On 19th-century British liberal internationalism, see Sylvest (2009); Bell and Sylvest (2006). On transnational dimensions of the peace movement, see Howard (2008: ch. 2); Cooper (1991); Mazower (2012: 3–154).
10. I have adapted the threefold typology used by Laity (2001: 9–10), who distinguishes liberal, radical and socialist arguments. However, this terminology can be misleading, for most radicals were self-professed liberals.
11. On Gladstone, see Ceadel (2006); on Angell, see Ceadel (2009). See Sylvest (2009) on the hesitant shift towards international institutions in liberal thought at the turn of the century.
12. Mill also thought that colonialism had pacifying effects by reducing the number of units in the international system (Bell, 2010b).
13. Green's conclusions were largely liberal-systemic — free trade and the 'dream of an international court with authority resting on the consent of independent states' (1911: 179).
14. Much of the most innovative socialist thought emanated from Germany, see Chickering (1975).
15. On the US peace movement, see DeBenedetti (1980); Patterson (1976).
16. Note, though, that the republican tradition also contained the resources for justifying imperialism (Bell, 2009).
17. Wilson himself wrote very little about democracy and foreign affairs until World War I, and even then his views were ambiguous, though he clearly held some version of the monadic account. As Thompson (2013) notes, he was not an advocate of extensive democracy promotion, not least because he thought democracy was only suitable for societies with suitable social conditions and 'character' (an argument ultimately derived from Burke).

18. Lenin picked out this passage for critique (and comparison with Kautsky's writing) in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, where he described it as expressing 'the cant of English parsons' (1996 [1916]: 122).
19. Giddings, who held the first chair of sociology in the US (at Columbia), features in Hobson's (2012) account of the Eurocentrism of IR theory, as well as Vitalis's analysis of the racial origins of IR (2010: 916–917), though neither explores this dimension of his thought.
20. Despite his claim about tolerance, Giddings was adamant that progressive democracies required ethnically homogeneous populations, and he supported strict immigration controls. See here the material in Box 3, Giddings papers, Butler Library, Columbia University. This was a common argument (Lake and Reynolds, 2008).
21. For the idealist context, see Boucher (1994); Morefield (2005).
22. Ritchie responded to Robertson by reiterating his earlier views and offering a cosmopolitan critique of sovereignty (1901b: 494).
23. Reid was a former Premier of New South Wales and the fourth Prime Minister of Australia.
24. As such, this account differs significantly from the immanentist approach inspired by Ernst Bloch (cf. Brincat, 2009; Levitas, 1990: ch. 4).
25. On Carnegie's political thought, see Eisenstadt (2007). For Carnegie's veneration of Spencer, see, for example, his letters to John Morley (9 October 1900, Fol. 78), and Herbert Spencer (10 October 1900, Fol. 78), Andrew Carnegie papers, Library of Congress.
26. While his 1893 essay attracted wide attention, Carnegie had long been preaching unity. See, for example, 'Home Rule in America: A Political Address', St Andrew's Hall, Glasgow, 13 September 1887 (Box 250, Carnegie papers). He claimed paternity of the idea, suggesting Cecil Rhodes must have taken it from him after hearing it discussed by their mutual friend Stead (Letter to Stead, 30 May 1903, Fol. 94, Carnegie papers).
27. An Anglophile, Mahan welcomed the Anglo-American rapprochement, writing to one British correspondent 'In my honor, reverence, and affection, Great Britain stands only second to my own country', and noting that he felt a sense of 'race patriotism' (letter to Col. Sterling, 13 February 1896, Mahan papers, Reel 2, Library of Congress). Yet (contra Carnegie) he was deeply sceptical of both plans for political union and international arbitration. In an earlier letter to G.S. Clarke, he wrote: 'Carnegie is nowhere — and vaporous' (29 July 1894, Reel 2).
28. Smith and Carnegie did cooperate on one issue, though: the campaign to merge Canada with the United States. Indeed, Carnegie funded some of Smith's (wildly unpopular) efforts to advance the cause in Canada. See Carnegie, letter to Smith, 6 February and 4 May 1896, Fols 36 and 37, Carnegie papers.
29. For discussion of this trope, see Bell (2007).
30. The scholarship on Wells typically argues that he dropped his early racial vision in favour of a more cosmopolitan one during World War I. Although I think there were greater continuities in his thought, I leave this question aside here. For IR accounts of Wells, see Deudney (2001); Partington (2003).
31. For overviews of the genre, see Clarke (1992); Franklin (1998: ch. 1); Matarese (2001: chs 2–3).

References

Abbott L (1898) Basis of Anglo-American alliance. *North American Review* 166: 513–521.

Anderson S (1981) *Race and Rapprochement: Anglo-Saxonism and Anglo-American Relations, 1895–1904*. Rutherford, NJ: FDU Press.

Barkawi T (2010) Empire and order in international relations and security studies. In: Denmark R III (ed.) *The International Studies Encyclopaedia*. Chichester: Blackwell-Wiley, 1360–1379.

Baum T (2008) A quest for inspiration in the liberal peace paradigm: Back to Bentham? *European Journal of International Relations* 14(3): 431–453.
Beaupre M (2012) What are the Philippines going to do to us? E.L. Godkin on democracy, empire and anti-imperialism. *Journal of American Studies* 46(3): 711–727.
Bell D (2007) *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Bell D (2009) Republican imperialism: J.A. Froude and the virtue of empire. *History of Political Thought*, 30(1): 166–191.
Bell D (2010a) Writing the world: Disciplinary history and beyond. *International Affairs* 85(1): 3–22.
Bell D (2010b) John Stuart Mill on colonies. *Political Theory* 38(1): 34–64.
Bell D (2012) The project for a new Anglo century: Race, space, and global order. In: Katzenstein P (ed.) *Anglo-America and its Discontents*. London: Routledge, 33–56.
Bell D (2013) Beyond the sovereign state: Isopolitan citizenship, race, and Anglo-American union. *Political Studies* (forthcoming).
Bell D and Sylvest C (2006) International society in Victorian political thought: T.H. Green, Herbert Spencer, and Henry Sidgwick. *Modern Intellectual History* 3(2): 1–32.
Beresford C (1899) The Anglo-American entente. *Pall Mall Magazine* 18: 379–383.
Boucher D (1994) British idealism, the state and international relations. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 55(4): 671–694.
Bowden B (2009) *The Empire of Civilization: The Evolution of an Imperial Idea*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Boyle F (1999) *Foundations of World Order: The Legalist Approach to International Relations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Brincat S (2009) Reclaiming the utopian imaginary in IR theory. *Review of International Studies* 35: 581–605.
Campbell DA (2007) *Unlikely Allies: Britain, America and the Victorian Origins of the Special Relationship*. London: Continuum.
Carnegie A (1893) A look ahead. *North American Review* 156(439): 685–710.
Carnegie A (1898) Anglo-American alliance: A look today. Unpublished manuscript, Box 251, Andrew Carnegie papers, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
Carnegie A (1909) Notes for speech at the Presentation of the Freedom of Glasgow, 10 September 1909, Box 251, Carnegie papers.
Cavallar G (2001) Kantian perspectives on democratic peace: Alternatives to Doyle. *Review of International Studies* 27(2): 229–248.
Ceadel M (1996) *The Origins of War Prevention: The British Peace Movement and International Relations, 1730–1854*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ceadel M (2000) *Semi-Detached Idealists: The British Peace Movement and International Relations, 1854–1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ceadel M (2006) Gladstone and the liberal theory of international relations. In: Ghosh P and Goldman L (eds) *Politics and Culture in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ceadel M (2009) *Living the Great Illusion: Norman Angell, 1872–1967*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 74–94.
Chamberlain J (1899) Speech at Leicester (30 November). *The Times* 1 December: 7.
Chickering R (1975) *Imperial Germany and a World without War: The Peace Movement and German Society, 1892–1914*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Cooper S (1991) *Patriotic Pacifism: Waging War on War in Europe, 1815–1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Claeys G (2009) The reshaping of the utopian genre in Britain, c.1870–1900. In: Claeys G (ed.) *Late Victorian Utopianism: A Prospectus*, I. London: Pickering & Chatto, ix–xxx.
Clarke IF (1992) *Voices Prophesying War: Future Wars, 1763–3749*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cust H (1902) Cecil Rhodes. *North American Review* 175(548): 99–114.
DeBenedetti C (1980) *The Peace Reform in American History*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Deudney D (2007) *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Deudney D (2001) Greater Britain or greater synthesis? Seeley, Mackinder and Wells on Britain in the global industrial era. *Review of International Studies* 27(1): 187–208.
Dos Passos JR (1903) *The Anglo-Saxon Century and the Unification of the English-speaking People*, 2nd edn. New York: Putnam.
Doty RL (1993) The bounds of 'race' in international relations. *Millennium* 22: 443–461.
Dougall JD (1885) An Anglo-Saxon alliance. *Contemporary Review* 48: 693–707.
Doyle M (1983a) Kant, liberal legacies, and foreign affairs. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 12(3): 205–235.
Doyle M (1983b) Kant, liberal legacies, and foreign affairs. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 12(4): 323–353.
Doyle M (1986) Liberalism and world politics. *American Political Science Review* 80(4): 1151–1169.
Easley E (2005) *The War over 'Perpetual Peace': An Exploration into the History of a Foundational International Relations Text*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Eisenstadt AS (2007) *Carnegie's Model Republic: Triumphant Democracy and the British–American Relationship*. Albany: SUNY.
Franklin HB (1998) *War Stars: The Superweapon and the American Imagination*, rev. edn. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
Garrison WL (1898) War and imperialism fatal to self-government. *The Advocate of Peace* 60(9): 208–212.
Giddings F (1900) *Democracy and Empire*. London: Macmillan.
Godkin EL (1897) Imperialism. *The Nation* 65: 511.
Gong G (1984) *The Standard of 'Civilization' in International Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Green TH (1911) *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation*, ed. Bosanquet B, *Philosophical Works*. London: Longman's.
Hayes J (2011) The democratic peace and the new evolution of an old idea. *European Journal of International Relations* 18(4): 767–791.
Hobhouse LT (1904) *Democracy and Reaction*. London: T.F. Unwin.
Hobson C (2011) Roundtable: Between the theory and practice of democratic peace. *International Relations* 25(2): 147–185.
Hobson JA (1902) *Imperialism: A Study*. London: Macmillan.
Hobson JA (1906) The ethics of internationalism. *International Journal of Ethics* 17(1): 16–28.
Hobson JM (2012) *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760–2010*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Howard M (2008) *War and the Liberal Conscience*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Ikenberry J (2001) *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Ish-Shalom P (2013) *Democratic Peace: A Political Biography*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

James W (1987) The moral equivalent of war (1906). In: James W, *Writings, 1902–1910*. New York: Penguin.
Koskenniemi M (2001) *The Gentle Civiliser of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law 1870–1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kramer PA (2002) Empires, exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and rule between the British and United States empires, 1880–1910. *Journal of American History* 88(4): 1315–1353.
Kupchan C (2010) *How Enemies Become Friends: The Sources of Stable Peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Laity P (2001) *The British Peace Movement, 1870–1914*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Lake M and Reynolds H (2008) *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lenin VI (1964 [1915]) The principles of socialism and the war of 1914–15. In: *Collected Works*, vol. 21. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Lenin VI (1996 [1916]) *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. London: Pluto.
Levitas R (1990) *The Concept of Utopia*. Syracuse, IN: Syracuse University Press.
Levy JS (1988) Domestic politics and war. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4): 653–673.
Luckhurst R, Brake L, Mussell J et al. (eds) (2012) *W.T. Stead: Newspaper Revolutionary*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Luxemburg R (1911) Peace utopias. *The Labour Monthly* (July): 421–428.
Mahan AT and Beresford C (1894) Possibilities of an Anglo-American reunion. *North American Review* 159(456): 551–573.
Matarese S (2001) *American Foreign Policy and the Utopian Imagination*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
Mazower M (2012) *Governing the World: The History of an Idea*. London: Penguin.
Mill JS (1965 [1848]) *Principles of Political Economy, Collected Works*, III, ed. Robson J. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Morefield J (2005) *Covenants without Swords: Idealist Liberalism and the Spirit of Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Nakhimovsky I (2011) *The Closed Commercial State: Perpetual Peace and Commercial Society from Rousseau to Fichte*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Newton DJ (1985) *British Labour, European Socialism, and the Struggle for Peace, 1889–1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Odell S (1898 [1939]) *The Last War: Or, the Triumph of the English Tongue*. Chicago, IL: Kerr.
Oren I (1995) The subjectivity of the democratic peace. *International Security* 20(2): 147–184.
Orwell G (1968 [1939]) Not counting niggers. In: *The Collected Letters, Essays, and Journalism of George Orwell, Vol. 1*, eds Orwell S and Angus I. London: Secker & Warburg, 360–361.
Paine T ([1906 [1791]) *The Rights of Man*, ed. Bonner H. London: Watts.
Partington J (2003) *Building Cosmopolis: The Political Thought of H. G. Wells*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Patterson DS (1976) *Towards a Warless World: The Travail of the American Peace Movement, 1887–1914*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Rawls J (1999) *The Law of Peoples: with 'The Idea of Public Reason Revisited'*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Recchia S and Urbinati N (2009) Giuseppe Mazzini's international political thought. In: Recchia S and Urbinati N (eds) *A Cosmopolitanism of Nations: Giuseppe Mazzini's Writings on Democracy, Nation Building, and International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1–31.
Reid C (2004) Peace and law: Peace activism and international arbitration, 1895–1907. *Peace & Change* 29(3): 521–548.

Reid GH (1909) An after-glance at the visit of the American fleet to Australia. *North American Review* 189(640): 404–409.
Rhodes C (1902) *The Last Will and Testament of Cecil J. Rhodes*, ed. Stead W.T. London: Review of Reviews.
Ritchie DG (1901a) War and peace. *International Journal of Ethics* 11(2): 137–158.
Ritchie DG (1901b) The moral problems of war — a reply to Mr J.M. Robertson. *International Journal of Ethics* 11(4): 493–505.
Robertson JM (1901) The moral problems of war. *International Journal of Ethics* 11(3): 273–290.
Robinson HP (1911) *The Twentieth Century American: Being a Comparative Study of the Peoples of the Two Great Anglo-Saxon Nation*s. New York: Chautauqua.
Schmidt B (1998) *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Schmidt B (2012a) On the history and historiography of international relations. In: Carlsnaes W, Risse T and Simmons B (eds) *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd edn. London: Sage.
Schmidt B (ed.) (2012b) *International Relations and the First Great Debate*. London: Routledge.
Schwarz B (2011) *The White Man's World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Shilliam R (2006) What about Marcus Garvey? Race and the transformation of sovereignty debate. *Review of International Studies* 32(3): 379–400.
Shilliam R (2008) What the Haitian revolution might tell us about development, security and the politics of race. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 50(3): 778–780.
Sidgwick H (1903) *The Development of European Polity*, ed. Sidgwick E. London: Macmillan.
Smith G (1893) Anglo-Saxon union: A response to Mr. Carnegie. *North American Review* 157(441): 170–185.
Streit C (1939) *Union Now: A Proposal for a Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic*. New York: Harper.
Sylvest C (2009) *British Liberal Internationalism, 1880–1930: Making Progress?* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Thompson J (1987) *Reformers and War: American Progressive Publicists and the First World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thompson J (2013) Woodrow Wilson. In: Cox M, Lynch T and Bouchet N (eds) *US Foreign Policy and Democracy Promotion*. London: Routledge.
Tracy L (1896) *The Final War*. London: Putnam's.
Tully J (2009) Lineages of contemporary imperialism. In: Kelly D (ed.) *Lineages of Empire: The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Vitalis R (2000) The graceful and generous liberal gesture: Making racism invisible in American international relations. *Millennium* 29(2): 331–356.
Vitalis R (2010) The noble American science of imperial relations and its laws of race development. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52(4): 909–938.
Vucetic S (2011a) *The Anglosphere: A Genealogy of a Racialized Identity in International Relations*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
Vucetic S (2011b) A racialized peace? How Britain and the US made their relationship special. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 7(4): 403–422.
Walker T (2000) The forgotten prophet: Thomas Paine's cosmopolitanism and international relations theory. *International Studies Quarterly* 44(1): 51–72.
Wallas G (1908) *Human Nature and Politics*. London: Constable.
Waltz K (1959) *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Weiss T (2009) What happened to the idea of world government? *International Studies Quarterly* 53(2): 253–271.

Wells HG (1934) *Experiments in Autobiography*, 2 vols. London: Gollancz.
Wells HG (1999 [1902]) *Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress upon Human Life and Thought*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
Wertheim S (2012) The League of Nations: Retreat from international law? *Journal of Global History* 7(2): 210–232.
Wilson W (1901) Democracy and efficiency. *Atlantic Monthly* 87(521): 289–299.
Wooley W (1988) *Alternatives to Anarchy: American Supranationalism since World War II*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Author biography

Duncan Bell is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Cambridge, and a Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. He works on the history of political thought, focusing on modern imperial ideologies, and aspects of contemporary international political theory. He is the author of *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton, 2007), and the editor of several volumes, the most recent of which (with Joel Isaac) is *Uncertain Empire: American History and the Idea of the Cold War* (Oxford, 2012).